

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
NORTHERN DIVISION

JEFFERY R. BURNETT,

Plaintiff,

File No. 2:13-CV-168

v.

HON. ROBERT HOLMES BELL

MICHIGAN ATTORNEY GENERAL,

Defendant.

---

**ORDER APPROVING AND ADOPTING  
MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

On June 14, 2013, United States Magistrate Judge Timothy P. Greeley issued a report and recommendation ("R&R") recommending that Plaintiff Jeffery R. Burnett's *pro se* civil rights action against the Michigan Attorney General's Office be dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) because it fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted. (Dkt. No. 8, R&R.) Plaintiff timely filed objections to the R&R. (Dkt. No. 9.)

This Court is required to make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the R&R to which specific objection has been made, and may accept, reject, or modify any or all of the Magistrate Judge's findings or recommendations. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).

Plaintiff objects to dismissal of his case. He contends that because the county prosecutor has refused to prosecute the state judges and attorneys who mishandled his

mother's estate, this is his last recourse for remedying the violation of his civil rights. He contends that Defendants are not immune from suit, that he is disabled under both federal and state disability statutes, and that the other cases he has filed in this court are not relevant to the disposition of his current case.

None of Plaintiff's objections is sufficient to persuade this court that the R&R should be rejected or modified. The Magistrate Judge correctly determined, based on the allegations in Plaintiff's current complaint, that Plaintiff has no federally enforceable right to have criminal charges investigated or prosecuted, and that this Court is precluded under the *Roquer-Feldman* doctrine from reviewing state-court decisions. The Magistrate Judge's determination was not based on immunity, and was not based on Plaintiff's prior actions. The fact that Plaintiff is disabled under federal disability statutes does not give this Court jurisdiction to review his state law claims. Accordingly,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff's objections to the R&R (Dkt. No. 9) are **OVERRULED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the June 14, 2013, R&R (Dkt. No. 8) is **APPROVED** and **ADOPTED** as the opinion of the Court.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff's motion for order for criminal review (Dkt. No. 7) is **DENIED AS MOOT**.

Dated: August 28, 2013

/s/ Robert Holmes Bell  
ROBERT HOLMES BELL  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE